IPR: Closed Contract Database (CCdb)
December 23, 1998

Closed Contract Database (CCdB) - briefed by Dan Moriarty (via conference call), Project Officer (PO) and Patty Tellez, Functional Sponsor, to COL Olear. Others present: Karen Clougherty, Andy Blaher and Tory Baggiano .

Minutes From IPR:

- COL Olear called IPR to discuss the Funding Issue
- The funding required for MOCAS operations (including CCdB) had been taken by PBD, but may be returned via the Y2K supplement in whole, in part, or not at all.
- IF DCMC receives the supplement, authorization to spend funds must wait until we receive them
- If we do not receive the Y2K supplement, DFAS will need to fund CCdB to finish deployment
- COL Olear recommended to proceed w/ CCdB as if DCMC will receive no more funding for the project (which may very well be the case)
- Options are: for DCMC to run up a tab with DSDC or, see what DFAS will do if they have to fund all remaining deployment for CCdB
- COL Olear tasked Dan Moriarty to contact DFAS to see what they are willing to do regarding the deployment of CCdB without DCMC funding (which was projected to be $159,000 of the $244,600 total CCdB cost for FY99)
- Based on the DFAS reply, DCMC will decide next move
- It was predicted DFAS may choose NOT to complete the "section 9" portion of CCdB programming as it is a DCMC, not a DFAS, priority
- Without DCMC funding, CCdB would probably be fielded without some DCMC requirements
- It was recommended that we restore (or increase) MOCAS functionality by putting back code for Section 9. Both DFAS and DCMC did agree to delete Section 9, because at the time it was to our advantage, i.e., saving space on the mainframe since we did not need it as we were going to get multiple queries to retrieve data. The multiple query capability was postponed (deleted from the current SSS) to save funds for FY99, as it would be cheaper and quicker to restore Section 9.
- We are told that restoration of Section 9 is not a major cost driver in this FY99 funding request. **Please see Patty's complete explanation of the issue below, which explains the operational effects of "section 9" (previously reported to the ITJSG)**
- It was stated DFAS might include "section 9" as most of the cost for CCdB is for testing as only a small portion of cost was projected for "section 9" programming
- It was suggested that DCMC try to get DFAS to complete all DCMC's requirements on the promise that if DCMC eventually receives funding for CCdB, we would reimburse DFAS up to the $159,000
- COL Olear recommended not to promise anything as it would be misleading to DFAS

From Patty Tellez's earlier report, per e-mail 11/24, to the ITJSG:

DSDC provided me with an SSS from May 2, 1997, where our DCMC program manager approved the requirements on May 6, 1997, authorizing the removal of Section 9 in MOCAS, to save mainframe processing time and DASD (space) on the mainframe. It was planned that multiple key queries would allow for retrieval of information. Also, at that time DCMC HQ was not asking for as much past history to be queried, i.e.: number of progress payments paid, final vouchers, commercial contract financing, performance based payments, etc., when this decision was made.

Currently DCMC HQ and the Paperless Contracting Center are requesting a wide range of historical data for process and metric analysis by SDW queries. If Section 9 is not restored, much of this data will not be available.

During the summer of 1998, the multiple key queries were eliminated from the current SSS to save DCMC time and money to allow for the CCDB to be fielded as soon as possible. The economical choice was to postpone the multiple key query capability, but that requires restoring Section 9.

Also, the ability of CCDB to transfer contracts between the three current databases (MOCs) which make up MOCAS is an advantage to DCMC. Currently, we have to wait until time is available to make external transfers, which could be up to three months delay. With CCDB, we could make these transfers shortly after receiving the modification transferring the contracts.

The $244,613.46 (DCMC's share is $158,998) still required to field the CCDB is comprised of the changes in requirements, which must be system tested (contractor acceptance) and recertified, functional testing (government acceptance) and ET/IOC (operational test) and project support for 20 working days. The cost to restore the Section 9 code is minimal.